

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed August 26, 2008. Claims 1-25 were originally presented. Claims 20-25 were previously cancelled. Claims 1-4, 7-10, and 16-19 have been amended herewith. Thus, claims 1-19 remain pending in the application. No new matter whatsoever has been introduced through the amendments to the claims.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,789,997 ("Hayward") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,386,772 ("Klinefelter") alone, and/or in further view of Official Notice.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Hayward in view of Klinefelter, in view of Official Notice and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,029,031 ("Yokomori").

Claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Hayward in view of Klinefelter alone, or in further view of Official Notice, and in further view of Yokomori.

Claim 1 has been amended and, as amended, recites a method, comprising:

- ***retrieving device data from component memory of a replaceable component from a device used by a customer;***
- storing the device data in a customer database;
- accessing the device data in the customer database; and
- ***assisting a customer with solving problems related to the device by way of the device data.***
(Emphasis added.)

Hayward fails to teach or suggest retrieving device data from component memory of a replaceable component from a device used by a customer, as recited by claim 1, as amended. The Examiner has already acknowledged this deficiency of Hayward (Page 5 of Office action). Additionally, Hayward fails to teach or suggest assisting a customer with solving problems related to the device by way of the device data, as recited by the subject matter of claim 1, as amended.

Rather, Hayward is directed to sensing a state or condition of a peripheral device and using that information to trigger an order for (i.e., purchase of) a replacement component (Abstract of Hayward). Specifically, Hayward is drawn to using a sensor or sensors 12 within a peripheral 10 to determine if a consumable item or part such as paper, ink, toner, etc., is depleted and replenishment is required (Fig. 2; Col. 5, lines 6-16 of Hayward). Under Hayward, a replacement component can be automatically ordered if need for such is detected (Fig. 8; Col. 9, lines 8-42 of Hayward).

However, Hayward is completely silent as to any system, method or means for providing any sort of **problem solving customer assistance**. More to the point, Hayward is not directed to retrieving device data from component memory of a replaceable component, and using that retrieved device data so as to assist a customer with solving a problem. To the contrary, Hayward depends upon one or more sensors within a peripheral device (not the replacement component) to detect a low or depleted condition of a consumable. Hayward is further dependant upon an electronic communications network (not the replacement component or any part thereof) in order to communicate a corresponding order for a consumable back to a supplying entity. This is not the same as the subject matter of claim 1, as amended.

Hayward simply does not teach, suggest nor motivate one of ordinary skill in the art toward the particular subject matter of claim 1, as amended. Hayward is directed to solving a different problem in a different way (i.e., provisioning of consumable supplies), and is not concerned with assisting a customer in problem resolution. In order to more fully appreciate the foregoing distinctions, a selected excerpt of the pending Specification as originally filled is reproduced below for convenience:

*At step 505, the information obtained from the customer database 224 is used to develop customized menus, or help screens, that are **displayed to the customer service operator for a specific customer**. The customized menus are developed according to the product(s) owned by the customer and the environment within which the customer uses the product(s). For example, suppose a customer owns a "Model 8500" printer and that a "Model 8500" printer does not have a power switch on it. In this case, the menu would be customized to omit any references to a power switch. For instance, **typical troubleshooting instructions might have the operator ask the customer to power the printer off and then on again. Since***

the customer's printer, in this case, does not have a power switch, such an instruction would be omitted. Hence, the instructions provided to the operator would be "streamlined" to conform to the customer's equipment and environment. This helps the operator to get to the heart of the customer's problem more quickly and provides a better experience for the customer. (Page 16, line 17 to page 17, line 4 of Specification. Emphasis added.)

Thus, Hayward fails to provide, teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 1, as amended.

Klinefelter fails to cure the deficiencies of Hayward. In particular, Klinefelter fails to teach or suggest assisting a customer with solving problems related to the device by way of the device data, as recited by the subject matter of claim 1, as amended.

Rather, Klinefelter is directed to providing an ID tag on a ribbon supply roll (or other consumable) that is used to store information regarding use of that ribbon within a printer (Col. 2, lines 39-50; Col. 6, lines 4-16 of Klinefelter). Under Klinefelter, memory on board the ID tag can be used to store and recall usage data while the ribbon is consumed and/or when the ribbon is migrated between printers (*Id.*). In this way, a printer that receives such a ribbon under Klinefelter is provided with information regarding the number of printing cycles remaining, ribbon tensioning information, positioning of the ribbon within the printer, etc.

However, Klinefelter is not concerned with providing any sort of ***problem-solving customer assistance***. Klinefelter is concerned with storing particular usage data for an ink supply ribbon so that such ribbon can be used effectively during its life cycle at the end consumer. Klinefelter does not teach, suggest or motivate storing the device data in a customer database, and then accessing such device data so as to assist a customer in a problem solving scenario. Klinefelter is directed to a different solution to a different problem than the subject matter of claim 1, as amended.

Official Notice, as taken by the Examiner (Page 6 of Office action), fails to provide, teach, suggest or motivate any sort of assistance to a customer, and specifically assisting a customer with solving problems related to the device by way of the device data. Applicants respectfully request supporting documentary evidence should the Examiner reassert Official Notice with respect to the subject matter of claim 1, as amended, in accordance

with MPEP 2144.03.

One having ordinary skill in the art, being faced with the respective teachings of Hayward and Klinefelter, would not be motivated toward the particular subject matter as recited by claim 1, as amended. In particular, neither Hayward nor Klinefelter, whether considered alone or in any permissible combination, teaches or suggests: 1) storing device data in a customer database; 2) accessing that data; and then 3) assisting a customer in solving device problems by way of the device data.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants assert that the §103 rejection of claim 1, as amended, is unsupported and must be withdrawn. Applicants further assert that claim 1, as amended, is allowable.

Claims 2-9, as respectively amended, depend (directly or indirectly) from claim 1, as amended, and are also allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim.

Claim 10 has been amended and, as amended, recites a system, comprising:

- ***a recycling center to receive a used printing device replaceable component from a customer, the printing device replaceable component including component memory integrated therewith storing printing device data;***
- a customer database that stores customer information for multiple customers;
- ***a data transfer center wherein the printing device data is retrieved from the component memory and stored in the customer database; and***
- ***a customer service center configured to receive calls from the customer and to provide operator assistance to the customer using at least the printing device data or other data from the customer database. (Emphasis added.)***

Neither **Hayward nor Klinefelter**, whether considered individually or in any permissible combination, teaches or suggests a recycling center to receive a used printing device replaceable component from a customer, the printing device replaceable component including component memory integrated therewith storing printing device data, as recited by the subject matter of claim 10, as amended. Additionally, neither Hayward nor Klinefelter, whether considered individually or in any permissible combination, teaches or suggests a data transfer center wherein the printing device data is retrieved from the

component memory and stored in the customer database, as recited by the subject matter of claim 10, as amended. Furthermore, neither Hayward nor Klinefelter, whether considered individually or in any permissible combination, teaches or suggests a customer service center configured to receive calls from the customer and to provide operator assistance to the customer using at least the printing device data or other data from the customer database, as recited by the subject matter of claim 10, as amended. As argued above, neither Hayward nor Klinefelter is concerned with any sort of problem-solving customer assistance related to a printing device, nor any customer database to that end.

Yokomori fails to cure the mutual deficiencies of Hayward and Klinefelter. Specifically, Yokomori fails to teach, suggest or motivate a recycling center to receive a used printing device replaceable component from a customer, the printing device replaceable component including component memory integrated therewith storing printing device data, as recited by the subject matter of claim 10, as amended. Additionally, Yokomori does not teach or suggest a data transfer center wherein the printing device data is retrieved from the component memory and stored in the customer database, as recited by the subject matter of claim 10, as amended. Furthermore, Yokomori does not teach or suggests a customer service center configured to receive calls from the customer and to provide operator assistance to the customer using at least the printing device data or other data from the customer database, as recited by the subject matter of claim 10, as amended.

Rather, Yokomori is directed to a recycling method for use in refurbishing process (i.e., printer) cartridges (Abstract of Yokomori). There under, Yokomori teaches particular machining, materials provisioning and other steps used in restoring a spent cartridge to usable condition (*Id.*). However, Yokomori expresses no interest whatsoever in a **customer database**, nor any **RFID tag**, nor any sort of **operator assistance to a customer**. Yokomori is directed to recycling materials, and is not directed to the specific subject matter of claim 10, as amended.

Official Notice, as taken by the Examiner (Page 13 of Office action), fails to provide, teach, suggest or motivate any sort of customer service center configured to receive calls from the customer and to provide operator assistance to the customer using at least the

printing device data or other data from the customer database. Applicants respectfully request supporting documentary evidence should the Examiner reassert Official Notice with respect to the subject matter of claim 10, as amended, in accordance with MPEP 2144.03.

One having ordinary skill in the art, being faced with the respective teachings of Hayward, Klinefelter and Yokomori, would not be motivated toward the particular subject matter as recited by claim 10, as amended. Specifically, neither Hayward nor Klinefelter nor Yokomori, whether considered alone or in any permissible combination, teaches or suggests: 1) printing device data retrieved from the component memory and stored in the customer database; 2) a customer service center configured to receive calls from the customer; and 3) providing operator assistance to the customer using at least the printing device data or other data from the customer database.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants assert that the §103 rejection of claim 10, as amended, is unworkable and must be withdrawn. Applicants further assert that claim 10, as amended, is allowable.

Claims 11-15 depend (directly or indirectly) from claim 10, as amended, and are also allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim.

Claim 16 has been amended and, as amended, recites a method for assisting customers having problems with devices that use replaceable components with integrated component memory, the method comprising:

- ***compiling data retrieved from the component memory of a plurality of replaceable components into a customer database;***
- ***accessing the customer database;*** and
- ***assisting a specific customer so as to resolve a problem with a particular device using data within the customer database.***
(Emphasis added.)

Neither **Hayward nor Klinefelter**, whether considered individually or in any permissible combination, teaches or suggests the particular subject matter as recited by the subject matter of claim 16, as amended. As argued above, neither Hayward nor Klinefelter expresses any teaching, suggestion or motivation directed to **customer assistance**. More to the point, neither Hayward nor Klinefelter teaches, suggests or motivates assisting a

specific customer so as to resolve a problem with a particular device using data within the customer database, as recited by the subject matter of claim 16, as amended.

Official Notice, as taken by the Examiner (Page 6 of Office action), fails to provide, teach, suggest or motivate any sort of assistance to a customer, and specifically assisting a specific customer so as to resolve a problem with a particular device using data within the customer database. Applicants respectfully request supporting documentary evidence should the Examiner reassert Official Notice with respect to the subject matter of claim 16, as amended, in accordance with MPEP 2144.03.

One having ordinary skill in the art, being faced with the respective teachings of Hayward and Klinefelter, would not be motivated toward the particular subject matter as recited by claim 16, as amended. Specifically, neither Hayward nor Klinefelter, whether considered alone or in any permissible combination, teaches or suggests: 1) compiling data retrieved from the component memory of a plurality of replaceable components into a customer database; 2) accessing the customer database; and 3) assisting a specific customer so as to resolve a problem with a particular device using data within the customer database.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants assert that the §103 rejection of claim 16, as amended, is unworkable and must be withdrawn. Applicants further assert that claim 16, as amended, is allowable.

Claims 17-19, as respectively amended, depend (directly or indirectly) from claim 16, as amended, and are also allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submits that pending claims 1-19 are in a condition for allowance and request reconsideration of the application and allowance of all pending claims.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to either Robert Wasson at Telephone No. (360) 212-2338, or Scott K. Gallert at Telephone No. (360) 212-4903. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

IP Administration
Legal Department, M/S 35
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Sep-22-2008

/Scott K. Gallert/
Scott K. Gallert
Reg. No. 51,715